# THEOLOGY

VOL. LXI JULY, 1958 No. 457

## Editorial

IT is of course easier to assert that the laity should have a larger part in the government of the Church of England than to say how it can best be done. The theological and historical grounds for reform in this matter were established in the Report of a Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1902.[1] In April 1953 we welcomed the decision of the Archbishops to appoint a Commission "to consider how the clergy and laity can best be joined together in the Synodical Government of the Church", and we expressed the hope that its recommendations would be bold and comprehensive. Now that its Report has been issued,[2] we cannot say that our hopes have been altogether fulfilled. It is proposed that the Convocations and the Church Assembly should be maintained as separate institutions, and that Houses of Laity should be added to the Convocations. The alternative would be the formation of a National Synod in which the functions of the Convocations and the Church Assembly would be combined, and it appears that a minority of the members of the Commission would have preferred this solution. It is remarkable that on 18 April, in noticing the Report, both *The Times* and the *Church Times*, which are not inordinately radical in ecclesiastical outlook and which do not always see eye to eye, criticized it because it did not accept the idea of a National Synod. Indeed, the case for simplifying the Church's legislative machinery is as strong as that for giving the laity a larger part in it. It is to be feared that the Commission's proposal, despite the ingenuity with which it is defended, would further elaborate and complicate the machinery by the addition of two more Houses to the seven that already exist.

In April 1947 we called attention to Archbishop Lang's lament about "the enormous difficulty of getting things done in the existing system". "I could enlarge on that theme with the most pathetic eloquence," he said, speaking of the Convocations alone. "Two Houses, two Convocations, each House and each Convocation jealous of its own independence and of its own rights and privileges, and both Houses and the two Convocations extremely sensitive on all these matters. The fact that they meet very seldom and meet separately makes the conduct of the business of the Church of England almost impossible." In June 1954 Dr Wand, at that time Bishop of London,

[1] *The Position of the Laity in the Church.* Reprinted in 1953 by the Church Information Board with an introduction by Prof. Norman Sykes. Alongside this there should be read the April 1958 issue of *The Ecumenical Review*, which contains a number of articles on the role of the laity in the Church.

[2] *The Convocations and the Laity*, Church Information Board, 2s. 6d.

contributed an article to THEOLOGY on "Our Legislative Assemblies", in which he made the same point, and put forward the constructive suggestion that the Convocations and the Church Assembly should be united in a National Synod, the more formal and picturesque elements of Convocation being retained while its actual business would be merged with that of the Assembly. We regret that the Commission on Synodical Government did not work out a detailed scheme along these lines. Perhaps the Convocations themselves will show a greater wisdom.

* * * * *

The questions raised for theologians by linguistic analysis have already received a good deal of attention in THEOLOGY, and we shall need to hear much more about them yet. They are questions which, one may hope, will not be overlooked in any theological pronouncements that are made by the Lambeth Conference. The Master of the Temple in this number considers some books in this field that have lately appeared. Another, which has appeared even more recently, is Mr R. W. Hepburn's *Christianity and Paradox: critical studies in twentieth-century theology* (Watts, 18s.). A more accurate sub-title would have been "critical studies in mid-twentieth-century theology", since Mr Hepburn betrays no interest in, or familiarity with, the theological work that was done in the first quarter of the century.[1] But he shows a remarkably close and sympathetic acquaintance with the work of living theologians, e.g. Barth, Brunner, Farmer, Reinhold Niebuhr and Alan Richardson. His book is a singularly perceptive criticism of current lines of Christian apologetic, expressed with modesty but with rigorous logical acumen. It should be read by readers who felt the force of Mr Wren-Lewis's article on "Integrity in Apologetics". Mr Hepburn intends his book to be regarded as a contribution to a debate which is still in its early stages. He writes as a reluctant non-Christian who has so far been disappointed not to have discovered convincing grounds for belief. His quest is curiously individualistic: the Church with its tradition and experience does not seem to have made an impression on his mind. But he is representative of many inquirers who are putting to theologians—and especially to philosophical theologians—questions which must be fully faced. In a final, tantalizing brief, chapter—entitled "Scepticism and the Naturally Religious Mind"—Mr Hepburn inquires what forms of religious experience remain open to an honest sceptic.

* * * * *

A notable event for theological students is the publication by the British and Foreign Bible Society of a new edition of the Greek Testament which takes the place of the 1904 Nestle edition. The new

[1] E.g., he says that Schweitzer's eschatological interpretation of the original Gospel caused the collapse of Loisy's as well as of Harnack's interpretation, overlooking the fact that Loisy's interpretation was as eschatological as Schweitzer's.

edition,[1] which has been prepared by Dr Erwin Nestle (son of Dr Eberhard Nestle) and Prof. G. D. Kilpatrick, is furnished with a much fuller critical apparatus than the old edition, and incorporates the results of work that has been done on the text during the last fifty years but that has hitherto been hidden away in learned journals.

## The Necessity and the Limits of Analytical Reasoning

William Blake kept a special hatred for Newton and Locke who, he thought, tried to confine the mind within the limits of rational analysis. He appealed away from them to the creative imagination; and yet the effectiveness of his writing, and the power of his message, particularly as expressed in the longer poems, is seriously impaired by the undisciplined confusion of his images, which in spite of the commentators are often nearly or quite unintelligible. How much more he would have hated our contemporary philosophers! And in his dislike of their determined efforts to dissipate all mystery he would have found himself in sympathy with many contemporary theologians, and with some Christian philosophers, who in their turn are criticized for abdicating from the proper task of philosophy, in not even trying to give a reasonable justification for religious faith.

Our contemporary philosophers use a technique of logical and linguistic analysis which aims above all things at clarity. There are two questions here: (1) Is it possible that there are aspects of reality which are in some sense knowable but not amenable to such treatment? (2) And if so, can philosophy, perhaps by some other technique, elucidate and distinguish true from false? We have before us four books to take into account. Mr Michael Foster, in his modest and attractive little book,[2] answers the first question in the affirmative. Plato and the Bible are at one in this, that they are both aware of mysteries which can be known only in contemplation and in an attitude akin to prayer. For the Greeks (and incidentally for the Hindus) the mystery was akin to the human mind, and would reveal itself to disciplined inquiry, the chief requisite for which was detachment from the confusing influence of sense. For the Hebrews, God was unknowable but for the fact that he had chosen to reveal himself; and the chief requisite for receiving the revelation was repentance and the denial of human pride. Mr Foster shows great skill and insight in detecting the mysterious element in ethics, in doctrine (e.g. the unity of the Church is mysterious, in that we cannot say in advance what it would mean for the Church to be "united", nor exactly what we mean by saying that it is "one" even now); and also in prayer (for we can pray when we cannot specify in advance what

[1] Bound in art vellum, 8s. 6d.; also available in more expensive bindings at 15s. and 42s.

[2] *Mystery and Philosophy*. By Michael Foster. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

it would mean for the prayer to be answered). We shall return to the second question later on.

The Cambridge Symposium[1] consists of lectures given under the auspices of the British Council. Some of the lectures, such as those of C. D. Broad and A. C. Ewing, give beautifully lucid accounts of what has been happening in the last forty years or so, Broad in general philosophy, and Ewing in ethics. The chief defect of Broad is that he says nothing about himself. By way of contrast, Karl Popper describes how he himself solved the problem of induction, or rather provided a justification for actual scientific procedure without appealing to the unfounded expectation commonly supposed to underlie induction, viz. that the future will resemble the past, or that sufficient accumulation of instances makes the next instance certain to conform to the previous pattern. Form a theory first, and use it until some experience falsifies it and forces you to modify or abandon it. This is what marks off scientific from non-scientific procedure, e.g. psychological, where Freudian or some other theory can be used to explain whatever happens. Scientific procedure is a systematic use of trial and error, marked particularly by a critical and constructive use of error, setting deliberate traps for one's theory. But for the word "systematic" the amoeba, which also works by trial and error, would be a scientist, whereas actually it is too dogmatic. Not that there is any harm in a certain degree of dogmatism to start with —"if we accept defeat too easily, we may prevent ourselves from finding that we were very nearly right". R. B. Braithwaite also discusses induction in connexion with probability, and also comes to the conclusion that it is reasonable to follow the evidence in the sense of accepting the best supported hypothesis even though the conclusion must always fall short of deductive certainty.

In the same symposium the veteran G. E. Moore after more than forty years is found still talking about sense-data; in this case, what is the relation between what I directly see when I look at the outside of an opaque object and the surface of the object? A. J. Ayer is also discussing perception, in terms similar to those of his excellent Pelican *The Problem of Knowledge*. But most enlightening of all is Gilbert Ryle's brilliant historical survey of the Theory of Meaning, which shows in particular how J. S. Mill's assumption, that most words have denotation as well as connotation, led on to the paradoxical and indeed nonsensical dogma, in Russell and the early Wittgenstein, that there must be some entity for every statement to be "about", even if it is false or nonsense. Once this dogma has been rejected the field is free for the patient exploration of the actual use of words and sentences—so much more varied than the subject and predicate formula which has dominated logic since Aristotle's time.

In rightly rejecting the metaphysical dogma that there must be some entity to be denoted by any word that is capable of standing as the subject of a sentence, can we ignore the metaphysical questions

[1] *British Philosophy in the Mid-Century*. Ed. C. A. Mace. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

altogether, as simply due to misunderstanding how words work? Ryle would say that the fiction of sense-data has arisen from confusing observation words with words reporting sensations. But even here the metaphysical questions are still just round the corner, however carefully I speak, and even if I do not speak at all. The crescent moon as it appears to me, which disappears at once if I shut my eyes, private to myself; the crescent moon which anyone hereabouts can see, public to lots of actual and potential observers; the solid moon complete with its inside which no one could ever actually observe; and the ultimate particles or whatever they may be which underlie the concepts of the physicist—all these are in some sense, though not the same sense, real. Granted, the world does not "contain" them all in the way in which it "contains" the solid moon; it may be well to confine the word "exist" to the things which it does contain in that way. In some *other* sense, then, the world does contain my vision of the moon, which I can identify, remember and talk to you about. Ryle's razor may pare down the entities too far.

Margaret Masterman, in two very difficult essays, suggests that current English is not a suitable tool for metaphysics. A language is required, and rules for using it, which can express paradox otherwise than as nonsense. With the help of illustrations from Chinese she sketches out a language of ideograms, which could be combined into patterns, well or badly according to canons of its own. It is extremely difficult for one brought up on Greek and untrained in symbolic logic, to make this mean anything clear, until the ideograms have been translated or paraphrased into English. At the most one begins to get an inkling of how such a language could suggest analogies, and patterns repeated or imitated in various fields. A metaphysic expressed in it would be of the nature of poetry, as indeed Margaret Masterman shows by quotations, the more gnomic kinds of metaphysical utterances already are (including Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*). Actual Chinese, of course, embodies in its ideograms the insights of the Chinese people (e.g. the analogy between heaven and earth, and ruler and ruled, of which a picture is given in the text). It is hard to see how the artificial Chinese, or "Platonic Pidgin", on the construction of which we are told the author is already engaged, will do more than bring out again the insights built into it at the start. But those electronic computers can do no more, and yet they can be used to make discoveries. It will be very interesting to see.

The three essays on *Metaphysical Beliefs*[1] bear on our second question: How far can logical analysis help to distinguish truth from falsehood outside the field which science can investigate? Prof. Toulmin shows how people who write about science may commend as "scientific" attitudes or policies bearing on the meaning and conduct of life which have no warrant in genuine science at all. That is, they could not conceivably be tested experimentally. One of these is the myth of the Running Down Universe, used to inculcate a fatalistic

[1] *Metaphysical Beliefs*. Ed. A. Macintyre. S.C.M. Press. 25s.

attitude. The Second Law of Thermodynamics is a scientific theory about thermally isolated systems, but is meaningless when extended to the universe as a whole. It cannot therefore be used to commend any attitude, fatalistic, stoical or other-worldly, on the ground that something or other is going to happen to the universe. Again, the actual course of organic evolution has been used by Julian Huxley and others to commend moral policies and attitudes on the ground that they are in line with evolution; but no conceivable biological observation could decide for or against their rightness or whether optimism or pessimism is justified. This criticism is thoroughly in line with contemporary ethical thought, which insists that no accumulation of factual statements can entail an "ought".

But one may still question whether Prof. Toulmin has not left the issue confused. The logical impossibility of talking scientifically about the universe as a whole is one thing. The relevance or irrelevance to policies or attitudes of scientifically grounded predictions is quite another. Toulmin appears to concede that scientific predictions about the future course of the *earth's* history are possible (though at present precarious), and he suggests that they might e.g. stimulate our descendants to find means of boosting the earth nearer to the sun (or further away, or to emigrate *en masse*!). But if Toulmin has said, as he has, that *if* the physicists could certainly predict the running down of the entire universe, it must make a considerable difference to our view of the world, and we should have to decide on our attitude, stoical, epicurean or other; then surely *if* the physicists should prove that the solar system (or, if you like, the galaxy or the local group of galaxies) does behave as a thermally isolated system in the requisite sense, that too would call for the assumption of an attitude as near as no matter. And so throughout we find the complementary point being asserted, viz. that all conclusions about the distant future and distant regions are extremely precarious and quite likely will have to be changed again, as they have been before. The conclusion, "Don't think the scientific mythologies have any certain base in science, or that if they had they would entail any particular attitudes", is sound enough, but is commended by reasons which are not entirely consistent.

Mr Hepburn's essay is on "Poetry and Religious Belief". It is a most impressive attempt to grapple with the question of truth in religion. Religion, we are frequently and rightly told, is communicated by means of images, which convey a deeper insight and a more vital truth than can be expressed in rational terms of dogma and cold prose. This use of images is shared by the Bible with great poetry in general; and neither in the Bible nor in poetry is it possible to decode the language and say the same thing in other words. Does the Analogy which is here suggested between biblical theology and poetry give us an assurance that the reality in some way corresponds to the images, or does the final existential question have to be decided (if it can be decided) by rational argument? It is notable that Mr Hepburn is not content with commending attitudes and policies and evoking emotional responses (which the poet can well do), if

this means avoiding the question "Is it true?" He sees, for instance, how the rediscovery of the unity of the biblical pattern of images has immensely increased the impressiveness and the imaginative power of the Bible over our minds. He shows how the great poet, too, claims to have and to communicate an insight into the nature of things; and how both the poetic and the prophetic vision bring pattern and order and a sense of unity into the confusing detail of existence, and, as great tragedy does, maintain the dignity and significance of human life in the face of death itself. Mr Hepburn describes all this with great eloquence and insight; and it is for that reason all the more impressive that he never once lets himself "get away with it" and side-step the question of truth. In reading poetry we may suspend disbelief and submit ourselves to the poet's interpretation, entertain it imaginatively; but do we go further, and believe it? Plato and Blake, Charles Williams and Tolkien, communicate truth in a myth. We may use the word "truth" of a poem if it gives a true account of something that the poet felt or saw, something that is true to human nature, and of a Christian poem we may say that it truly communicates how the world looks to a Christian. Can we go further, need we go further, and say: That is how the world really is (e.g. created)? Can we go still further and say: This is how God really is (e.g. a Trinity)?

Mr Hepburn does not claim to have found the answer, but only to have sketched out a field for further investigation. One of the criteria to which he would refer the images is their conformity to historical facts; and here again there is an implied warning against the too easy acceptance of the fashionable theory that the facts only get their meaning in the light of an over-all interpretation. The determination, lucidity and modesty of Mr Hepburn, are most impressive.

But I think Mr Alasdair Macintyre would say that what Mr Hepburn wants just can't be had. In his extremely lucid paper he shows that belief in God can never be justified rationally as any sort of explanation for the facts of the world. "Theologians often behave as if their natural allies in philosophy were to be found among the metaphysicians, their natural enemies among the more sceptical and positivistic. Nothing could be further from the truth. Metaphysics might almost be described as a sustained attempt to replace conversion by argument. . . . For the metaphysician God becomes 'the great first cause'. The Positivist by contrast shows the impossibility of what the metaphysician seeks to do by exhibiting the fallacies involved in all metaphysical argument. In so doing he leaves open the possibility of exhibiting religious belief in its own terms."

"To believe in God resembles not so much believing that something is the case as being engrossed by a passion." But does it at all resemble believing that something is the case? Yes, says Mr Macintyre, here following Ian Crombie, for we accept on authority parabolic statements about God, "God so loved the world" in which "loved" has a sense drawn from human experience ("greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends") and

refer them to a Being whom we can never comprehend but whom we believe to be truly pointed to by the authorized images. We accept Christ as the revelation of God, and we mean by God the Father whom Christ reveals. The "argument" is frankly circular, and you can only get on to the circle by being converted; or, we may add, by being brought up on it and never having come unstuck.

Foster agrees with Macintyre that biblical faith can welcome modern philosophy as an ally. "The extrusion of the Hellenic model from philosophy which seems demanded from the biblical point of view is a task on which contemporary philosophy seems already largely to have been engaged. . . . The repudiation of synthetic *a priori* propositions in science and in morals is likewise to be seen as a renunciation of the inheritance of the Greek belief in the divinity of reason. There is thus a parallelism, or rather a convergence, between analytic and Christian criticism." Only in a footnote he adds "perhaps the elimination cannot be complete".

It is true that we should never have come to be where we are unless Christ and his saints had found us. It is true that "God" would be a meaningless word if there had never been a worshipper, and everything that is said about or to him is certain to sound like nonsense to the man who has never worshipped. It is true, as history shows, that philosophical and theological arguments are always persuasive rather than conclusive. Part of the arguments aim at showing that this assertion or the other is or is not an authentic part, is or is not compatible with, the whole biblical (Moslem, Marxist) way of looking at things; and in this there are rational canons of good and bad argument, which some controversialists observe more carefully than others and which do not depend on the overall truth of the view discussed. Within these limits it is possible (surely) to demonstrate that the denial of an after-life is incompatible with Christianity or Islam. But is it not possible and indeed necessary to go further, and try to give a rational account e.g. of what it would mean to be immortal, what is meant by identity in connexion with material things on the one hand, and with persons on the other . . . and so on? So again it is easy (surely) to demonstrate that the concept of "sin" is essential to Christianity. But is it not possible, and indeed necessary, to go further, and to try to see how this is related to what the psychologist and the biologist investigate? Part of this work will be to compare the uses made of words in prayer, in prophecy, in theology, in various sciences and in everyday life. And some of the puzzles and contradictions will be cleared up, and some of the superstitions on all sides will be exposed. Will be? But philosophy has always from the very first done this for the faith, and now, of all times, it would be treason to give up the attempt to make everything clear.

Only if this is accepted can the genuine mysteries be seen for what they are. Philosophy has always known that we could not comprehend God. *Neti, neti,* the Negative Way, the Form of the Good which is beyond being and knowledge and can only be hinted at in a myth —these are expressions of classical Platonic, universal insights, and the very dialectic which establishes them is Platonic (and incident-

ally Hindu) too. One day the tide will change, metaphysics will return to England, the Platonic strand in our tradition will come to life again. And in that day, Canon Adam Fox,[1] turning over the pages of his beloved Plato, and making selections to be contemplated along with suitable texts from the New Testament, will appear to be no mere survival, but one who waited peacefully by the trackside till the runners caught up with him again.

T. R. Milford.

---

## The Christian Understanding of Man's Sexuality

Every Christian belief takes its origin from the revealing action of God, known to man in human history or in the natural world. That is why the Christian understanding of the nature of man must constantly be referred back to the Incarnation and the Atonement, in which events Christians believe God took supreme action for man's redemption. The extraordinary fact is that the view of man which follows from the Christian faith is in remarkable correspondence with that picture of man which careful observation and scientific inquiry force upon us. So there are really two bases for a sketch of human nature such as we here offer as a background for the Christian understanding of man's sexuality: one is the revelation of God in Christ, the other is the result of our attempt reasonably to understand ourselves and our brethren in the light of such knowledge as we possess apart from special revelation.

This is not the place, nor need we spend the time, for a detailed consideration of the relation of man's reason and God's revelation. It must suffice to say that there is no necessary contradiction between these two, although the Christian faith is indeed based primarily on revelational events rather than on human reason. Neither need we say more about the problem of "special" and "general" revelation, than that the term "general revelation" may rightly be taken to denote such knowledge of God as we may receive through the study of the impact upon men of the natural order and the average "run" of human history, while "special revelation" may properly be seen in those particular and focal events, or series of events, which by their intensity and fruitfulness have become "important" for men, and may therefore be used as tests and criteria for the remainder of our experience. For our purpose, in this essay, it is important that we recognize the interplay of revelation and reason, and of general and special revelation, without being obliged to resort at every point to a careful discrimination between what is inevitably "of faith" and what is only "from reason" or general knowledge.

Several preliminary affirmations will prepare the way for our picture of man. We shall note them *seriatim*:

---

[1] *Plato and the Christians*. By Adam Fox. S.C.M. Press. 21s.

1. In the revelation of God in Christ, human nature was used by Divine Reality in a sacramental fashion. That is to say, an "outward and visible" thing, a human life, was the instrumental expression for an "inward and spiritual" Reality, God himself. Human nature was not destroyed nor damaged by this operation; rather it was perfected and brought to its fullest flower.

2. The whole process of creation, as well as the action of redemption, is sacramental in nature. Divine purposes, spiritual values and meaning, are at work in and through tangible, sensible realities. Our only way of knowing the former is through the latter: we have never seen "Love" but only "loving actions". Whatever meaning there may be in the universe is known to us in, through, and under the material embodiments of that meaning which we see, feel, hear.

3. The Christian Church, known as the "Body of Christ", is a dual reality, in which spiritual life works through, because it is present in, a visible organization. The Body of Christ is expressed in a body of men. The Church as *Corpus Christi* is corporately operative: and the two sides are related in so direct and intimate a fashion that one cannot be had without the other.

4. Christian worship is at its height in the Eucharist or Holy Communion, where bread and wine, physical things, are the instrumental media for the spiritual reality of the body and blood—that is, the true life—of the risen Christ for those who are members of his Church.

To these Christian theological statements we must add several further assertions, drawn from the realm of ordinary human experience and scientific investigation:

1. Man is an elaborately contrived organism in which mind and body appear to be so much a unity one with the other that human psychology and human physiology are not susceptible, in any final sense, of isolated treatment.

2. Whatever may be said of occasional reported instances of "extrasensory perception", it is by and large true that human experience is initially sensory. It may not be absolutely the case, but it is certainly largely the case, that nothing is in the mind which is not first in the senses. Our minds get to work on and react upon presentations of physical experience derived through the several senses, however many these senses may be.

3. The advances made in the treatment of the ills of human personality since the advent of a "psychosomatic" picture of man are so enormous that we cannot be sure whether mind or body is the basic seat of many human ailments. It has long been known that anxiety and peptic ulcers were closely related; now we know that many other bodily disorders have their root in mental disturbance; and *vice versa*.

4. Man's "embodiedness" includes not only his own physical body but also the "body corporate" as we say. The human race is so ordered that men form a social whole, living with and to a large degree living in other men. "It is not good for man to be alone"; and "God has set the solitary in families". This is both a natural and spiritual truth.

5. Common sense has never doubted that physical expression of mental and spiritual states is both necessary and desirable. The young man who tells his beloved that he loves her is acting naturally and (within whatever limits we may believe proper) desirably when he expresses this fact by kissing her. Patriotism is naturally and rightly shown by a salute to the flag. When children, challenged about the truth of a statement they have made, make a gesture which is described by them with the words "Cross my heart and hope to die", they are acting perfectly normally, properly and naturally.

I. Now all of these facts about man are the background for the view of human nature which is integral to the total Christian conception of the meaning of existence. And that view of human nature is the necessary presupposition for the Christian view of sexuality.

It has been a serious defect in much of the writing and thinking on this subject, even among Christians, that it has failed to begin with this theological and rational background and has started instead either with the sheer facts of man's sexual behaviour as observed, or with a set of supposed divine commands or moral imperatives which it is thought should govern such behaviour. In consequence, the whole enterprise has been unrelated to the basic facts of the nature of man and the meaning of his existence under God. No wonder, then, that the discussion has tended either towards "idealism", on the one hand, or to "practical realism", on the other. The former is so much in the clouds that it appears to have very little connexion with the concrete experience of men and women; while the latter is so much concerned with "right sexual adjustments" that it seems to be without any criteria of judgment and hence to be pragmatic in the most obvious and indeed superficial sense.

For the Christian the starting-point for a discussion on sexuality must be theological in the broadest sense; and the theology is reasonably developed in the context of general human experience and its meaning. Man is a body-mind organism, living in community with other men. He is himself a sacramental creature, in whom spiritual states, thoughts, feelings, aspirations, are expressed through a physical instrument; on the other hand, the things done with and by the body are profoundly related to, and have enormous consequences for, that which goes on in the mind or soul of "personality". And this construction of human nature is no accident, but is integrally related to the nature of the universe itself and to the way in which God works in it to accomplish his purposes.

Man's corporeal life, as the instrumental means for his spiritual and mental life, is intimately bound up (as we have seen) with the fact of his corporate existence. The individual human being is hardly a man, in the true sense of the word, unless he is in real community with his fellows. "Good Man Friday", alone on a desert island, is to that degree less than a full man. As M. Jacques Maritain has lately demonstrated, the word *person* is not to be taken as if it were but a synonym for *individual*. The latter describes *one instance* of a given species: a man, a dog, a stone, an electron. But the word *person* describes an instance of a given species—namely, man—who possesses the capacity

to enter into relationship with another of his kind; and the relationship is such that a warm, self-giving, shared experience is possible, without loss of the self and yet with communion of that self with others. In a word, person means *individual in community*. Man's sacramental nature, therefore, is both corporeal and corporate, through a *physical* body and in a *social* body.

II. There are two dangers which dog the endeavour to understand the fact of our human existence. Each comes from an attempt to build too exclusively on one side of our nature. If we devote our time and attention solely to the physical body, we are likely to reduce the functioning of human personality to sheer animalism, in which man is thought of, and even treated, as if he were only another beast. The consequences of this procedure, in the area of sexual expression, are obvious and terrible.

But if we give our whole thought to the mental or spiritual side of man, we are quite as likely to fall into frightful error. For we shall then be victims of "angelism", thinking of man as if he were pure spirit without body. And the consequences of this procedure are again obvious and terrible. A futile and self-destroying negation of the body brings about a warping and perverting of the spirit, with an ugliness that in some instances (as in François Mauriac's *Woman of the Pharisees*) is even worse than the result of animalism.

A similar danger is manifested in another way as between man the "individual" and man in community. If the uniting concept of person, meaning individual in community, is forgotten, we may attend exclusively to one or the other of the two terms. We may concern ourselves exclusively with the individual, forgetting the social medium which is essential to man's self-expression. In consequence, the horrors of "rugged individualism" will appear, with selfish, grasping efforts after "one's own good" and a callous disregard for the "good of others". But on the other hand, an exclusive interest in community can be equally dangerous, for this reduces man to an ant in an ant-hill, a bee in the hive, whose only purpose and function is to be part of a social order which can be served without concern for the single man or for his freedom and his happiness. That way lies fascism and the totalitarian state, in whatever guise (even a "democratic" one) it may present itself.

The bearing upon sexual life of the point made in the last paragraph should be obvious. When man's sexual nature is expressed without regard for the society in which he lives and of which he is, as person, a real part, we can have that unregulated individualistic exploitation of others which makes for chaos and anarchy. But it is also true—and this is perhaps the explanation of much of the demand for "sexual freedom"—that conformity to purely conventional social patterns can be destructive of the spontaneity of the person who is buried under the *mores*. A man or woman can never be himself in such a situation, but must always be submerged in the pressure towards simply conformity with the larger interest of society.

What is required to do justice to all the facts is a view of man as person in community, compounded of soul and body, placed in a

context in which he can be himself, as created by God, but freed from the ulterior drives of personality and also the accumulated repressions of a "closed" society. In religious language, he needs to be released from the incubus of sin, both inherited and actual, placed in the state of grace or freedom under God, and empowered to live according to God's will. But this is an impossibility for him, so far as his own efforts go. He must *be released*; he must *be placed* in grace; he must *be empowered.*

This need for restoration is intimately connected with man's sexuality although it is not expressed through that alone. The fact that man is a sexual animal is not in itself an evil thing. On the contrary it is a good thing, for sexuality, like everything else given by God in creation, is good in and of itself. Yet the first possibility—that man may either act as sheer animal or pretend that he can act as sheer spirit—and the second possibility—that he may live as a "rugged" individual with utter disregard for his brethren's good, or may lose himself in his social environment so that he becomes no more than a cog in the social machine—present occasion for sin on man's part. The appalling fact is that this occasion has been used by man to deny his God-given nature in all its richness and complexity. And that point in human life where such negation may be expressed most obviously, although of course in no sense exclusively, is the sexual realm. This can therefore be taken, as it was taken by St Augustine fifteen hundred years ago, and by Sigmund Freud, the other day, as a symbol of the total fact of perversion of personality.

Such perversion is not "total depravity", as commonly understood. It is rather a perversion of every area of man's experience, total only in the sense that it is found in each part of his existence as we know it rather than confined to some single aspect or aspects such as will or emotion. And there remains always basic to man that connexion with God which comes from the truth of his creation "in the divine image" and his grounding in the Word of God who is "the light that lighteth every man".

When man is freed from his sin, he is enabled to "transcend himself" without denying or neglecting any area of his existence as this is given by God. Apart from such restoration by God, his capacity to rise above his immediate experience and view his life from a quasi-transcendent perspective is itself indeed the chief occasion for his wilfulness. Nowhere is this more completely shown than in the arrogance of the Casanova or the hyprocrisy of the Pharisee.

Man needs *restoration.* Nothing in man needs destruction, excepting that his sinful affections and desires, with their rooting in his wilful mind and proud spirit, must be re-oriented and centred in God so that they are no longer sinful. What is needed is the bringing-back of human existence to the pattern set for it by Reality, by God. The ancient prayer in the Roman liturgy for the blessing of the water to be used in the eucharistic chalice puts this idea admirably: "O God who didst wonderfully create the dignity of man's nature and still more wonderfully hast restored it . . ." This *dignitas* —rightful ordering, in a place of honour in God's creation—is what

human nature has lost by its sin; restoration will bring about the healthy and natural functioning of man as son of God, according to God's intention and in agreement with God's will for his children.

For this reason, the attempts of many anthropologists, sociologists, biologists, etc., to discuss man's sexuality in terms merely of its "fallen" (that is, observable) expression, is entirely beside the point. So also is the confusion of "normal" in the sense of "what everybody does" with "normal" in the sense of that which man as true man should do and be. To reduce morality to *observed* behaviour is to destroy morality itself. What is even more significant, it is to destroy the peculiarly *human* element in human nature, since the distinctive thing about man is his double-awareness, both of his possible perfection and of his appalling fall from that possibility. It is difficult to have patience with the many writers on sexual matters who seem unable to recognize that there is a difference between *typical animal* and *normal human* expressions of sexuality. Nor need we wonder that as a result of their failure to see this difference, they often talk as if the solution of the problem of man's sexuality were the behaviour of the stud-farm, with a little gleam of spurious idealism to relieve the sheer animality of such brute behaviour.

III. There is a final point which is central to the whole Christian outlook. Man is made for God. "Thou hast made us for thyself, O God, and our heart is restless until it rest in thee." St Augustine's famous sentence, from the first chapter of the *Confessions*, is the classical expression of this truth. Yet the translation which we have just given, found in nearly all English versions, does not do justice to the rich sense of the original. St Augustine wrote, *Tu fecisti nos ad te*. The force of the preposition *ad* with the accusative, as any classical scholar knows, is to bring movement into the phrase. St Augustine should be translated therefore as saying: "Thou hast made us to move towards, grow towards, live towards, develop towards thee. . . ." His conception here, as indeed the whole of the *Confessions* shows, is not static; it is richly dynamic.

God had planted in us a strong and irresistible drive towards himself. If this drive were let have its way with us, we should find the rest in God, which is the goal of our human striving and the full satisfaction and completion of every area and aspect of our human personality. Since we do not permit this free work of God in us, we are disordered, unintegrated, warped and perverted creatures.

Now man's sexuality is so deep and real a part of human nature that of all expressions of man's existence it can best be taken as a central symbol of his personality. It is natural, then, that it should have its enormous place in that movement towards God or that movement towards self, which St Augustine describes as the twin possibilities for man. So sexuality visibly manifests, in many instances, the total orientation of the personality. The great bishop's well-known definitions, found in his *City of God*, of the two loves by which we live will help us here. He spoke, it will be recalled, of "love of God to the contempt of self", and "love of self to the contempt of God". But the "self" which is to be held in contempt by a true man

is not the *genuine* self, the God-intended person in its rich fulfilment in community. It is, on the contrary, the *immediate* self which desires, without ordering or control, to secure its own way and achieve its own ends, thereby losing all that is really good and gaining only the hell of self-disintegration. But when God is loved, to the contempt of *that* self, the genuine self is realized, for the drive of the personality is at one and the same time towards the Divine Reality in whom alone is happiness possible and also towards the fulfilment of the genuine self which is the ultimate meaning of human existence on the terrestrial level.

Thus in the sexual life, sexual "satisfaction" when sought for its own sake, without regard for the pattern in which it is placed and the ends for which it exists, is destructive. In the long run it can produce only dust and ashes, and in the end disintegration of human personality and human society. But when sought in the right pattern, ordered according to the God-given structure of human life, it can and does play its significant and sacramental role in the movement of man's personality towards his chief good. It enriches his experience and brings him deep and lasting joy.

For it is eternally true, despite much current theological writing, that *eros* and *agapé*—the first, the love of desire; the second, self-giving love—are not utterly separate and mutually contradictory. *Eros* may be purified and refined in the fire of the divine *Agapé*. In the idiom of the African saint whom we have already quoted, the divine *caritas* or love can redeem human *amor* or desire, so that the resulting human *dilectio* or delight in loving will be the holy desire which finds rest and satisfaction in the heavenly *Caritas*, in God himself.

W. Norman Pittenger.

---

## The Christian Approach to the East

It is a commonplace that we are living in an age that is witnessing the decline of the moral leadership of the West and the break-up of that Western civilization which for so long has had as its foundation the twin pillars of Hellas and Christianity. The parallel which the last agonies of the Roman Empire presents to our age is too close to be ignored. To-day civilization lies prostrate while the power blocs of the world jockey for position, ready to take advantage of any weakness which the other presents. We believe it to be an open question, in the light of the history of the past, whether any weapon is likely to be an ultimate deterrent; a new dark age may well lie before us the like of which has never before been known in history. Christianity is inexorably involved in this crisis through which the West is now passing. Political conditions have always had a not inconsiderable influence on Christian theological emphases, and this will probably continue to hold in the future. Christianity might well cease to be a missionary religion and, in so far as it survived the dissolution of the

West, would become totally other-worldly, despairing of the redemption of this world. The predominating emphases of Continental Protestant theology following the two world wars of this century are an indication of what might happen on a larger scale. God would become Wholly-Other, having no contact with this world save through certain events in which "the vertical strikes into the horizontal". Moreover, we have to consider the possibility that it may be no part of the ultimate divine purpose that Christianity in its Western form should survive at all.

Conditions in the East, at least in the foreseeable future, will be quite different. To-day we are witnessing the emergence of the East from the twilight of the past. The moral leadership of the world is increasingly passing to India because that vast continent alone has the spiritual resources necessary to sustain civilization. And it is not improbable that the great Eastern religions will be affected by these momentous changes. Hitherto Indian religion has been based on a world and life negation; when million upon million of people went through the recurring cycle of birth, life and death, generation after generation, without hope of any amelioration of their lot—when near-starvation and under-nourishment were the inevitable burden to be borne by the vast bulk of the population—then it was difficult to see in this world and in the concept of time itself anything but an illusion, and the object of religion was to escape from this recurring sequence by the practice of religious exercises and ritual. A man must purge his mind of the old illusion-self, the unreal, and find his way to the ground of all being, the Real. It is not easy to predict how the great religions of the East will change under the impact of a newly experienced belief in the value of this world. The immense depths of Eastern thought will always remain to beckon those who would follow. Yet in time modifications of traditional Eastern doctrines will undoubtedly come as has happened in the past. With industrialization, a rise in the standard of living and the spread of scientific methods of birth control—and here India's five-year plans are significant—the time process itself will slowly be seen to be invested with value, bringing opportunities of a fuller life for all. And the future may well see changes in the Eastern attitude to desire. With a poverty-stricken population, desire was necessarily productive of misery, for what was desired could not be obtained; in the future this will not necessarily be true. In particular, Buddhist doctrine may be expected to evolve into a greater world affirmation as its Hinayana and Mahayana branches awaken to feel that they have a mission to the world—and signs of this are now appearing.

These changes will be of immense significance in the approach of Christianity to the East. Hitherto the Church has adopted two attitudes towards the non-Christian Eastern religions. Either they are regarded as types of humanism which have nothing to do with the revelation of God in Christ—in which case the sole job of the Church is to preach the saving event of the Gospel and leave it to make its own way into the hearts and minds of the indigenous population. This radical approach is generally bound up with a Barthian-Hebraic

view of God's action in history. God reveals himself only in certain pivotal events and actions. It is obvious that this idea of revelation cannot ever hope to conquer the thought-world of the East. In itself it is particularist and intolerant and, moreover, pays no attention to the fruits of the Spirit undoubtedly manifest in the lives of some Muslims, Hindus and Buddhists. Buddhism in particular has been productive throughout the East of a tolerance, gentleness, a love of nature and the lower forms of life which puts the Christian West to shame. The other approach to the Eastern religions has been to acknowledge all that is good and noble in them and so find as much common ground as possible with Christianity. In many instances, Christians of a liberal persuasion have desired a new synthesis of their religion with the great historic faiths of the East. The weakness of this approach is that it tends to undermine the uniqueness of the work of Christ and fails to provide a wellspring for the missionary and evangelistic work of the Church. Furthermore, it perpetuates the fallacy that all religions are the same.

It may be suggested that there is a third approach to the great non-Christian religions which has as yet hardly been attempted by the Church—and that this approach is likely to be most suitable for the future. This is the method which was favoured by the Christian Platonists of Alexandria when confronting the thought-world of their day. Clement and Origen, as Justin Martyr before them, recognized what was noble in the teaching of the Greek philosophers as due to the same Logos which was incarnate in Jesus. These thinkers shared in the One divine Light which is shed abroad in the world, and so must make their contribution to the highest and fullest Christian truth. The Alexandrian Fathers would have agreed with Rumi, the Muslim poet and mystic, that "the lamps are different but the light is the same". If this is true—and an unbiased observer of the great Eastern religions cannot but believe it is true—then all that is finest and noblest in Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism is the work of the Logos of God. This means that the Church to-day should approach these religions with great reverence, humility and awe, being anxious to hear the voice of God speaking through them. A Christian will here be on holy ground. And Christianity itself will be immensely deepened and modified in this process. The whole depth of Indian thought has to be baptized into Christ—an enormous intellectual undertaking which the Church as yet has hardly begun. What is needed to-day are not scientific studies in comparative religion, valuable though these are in their own spheres; neither is the need for Christianity simply to place what is finest in the thought of the East side by side with the teaching of our Lord. The Church has to get under the skin of the East—to breathe deeply of its spirit and to incorporate in some measure its immense spiritual resources into the fabric of Christian life, thought and worship. This process will not be painless, for Christianity itself will be changed in the process, as in an earlier age Islam was changed through its contacts in India with Hinduism.

We may perhaps consider one or two ways in which this may

happen. Consider the *via negativa*, which is the typical Indian approach to the Ultimate. We have suggested that the future may see a greater world affirmation in Eastern religion. I believe that here will lie a fresh opportunity for the Church. It must not despise the *via negativa*—the view that the Infinite can be discovered only by stripping off the qualities and attributes which veil it and reached by divesting ourselves of all distinctions of personality. Indeed, Christianity should affirm that this is a valuable insight into the truth. We must all seek the Infinite through the limitations of the finite; we must all die continually to our lower selves that we may rise to higher things; every Christian should aim to eradicate sin and temptation, for the Christian life is essentially a pressing on to the goal ahead. Yet in the Christian apologetic to the East there will be a joyous affirmation that this *via negativa* is not enough. Immensely deep and profound though it is compared with so much of our superficial Christian practice in the West, it forgets that the goal of our earthly striving cannot be reached in time; that in the very depths of the Infinite, which is negatively defined, must lie a realm where the victory of good over evil is consummated and not simply neutralized or held in balance. For the Christian this is Love or the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. In such ways as these Christianity will incorporate and deepen within itself the great truths which the Eastern religions teach while going beyond them. This will not necessarily lead to a new Eastern Christian medieval mysticism of the kind which held sway for so long in Europe, for the affirmation of God and activity of the Logos as the guiding principle of the Universe will always be central, although the *via negativa* will hold its true place in the realm of the spiritual life. And the emphasis upon world-affirmation which the future may bring will provide new opportunities for Christian teaching concerning the Incarnation and the redemption of this world. Here the Bodhisattva ideal of Mahayana Buddhism—"he who saves others by his love for humanity"—is especially important, for it shows that the greatest of the non-Christian faiths has felt the need of a divine focus for its adoration much as the Logos in Christian theology needed to be focused in the person of Jesus. With this opportunity will come a recognition of the social responsibility of each person to his neighbour and to society. The kindness, tolerance and gentleness which so conspicuously have been the fruits of some types of Eastern religion will receive added depth when focused in the figure of our Lord. The idea of Christianity as "the Way", which is present in the catechetical teaching that underlies the New Testament epistles and in the "Two Ways" doctrine of the Epistle of Barnabas, the Didache and the Doctrina Apostolorum, should also be emphasized in the Church's apologia.

The winning of the thought-world of the East is one of the most urgent tasks of the Church, before which the domestic problems and controversies that occupy so much of our time in the West pale into insignificance. To-day, when we live at the end of an age as far as Western civilization is concerned, the need for a reasonable, thoughtful Christian apologetic to the East is paramount. In this connexion

it is rather tragic that the proposed agenda for the Lambeth Conference of 1958 shows no appreciation of this problem—or even of its existence. For the West there are signs that the hour hand may soon be nearing twelve. Now, more than at any other time, it is as essential for the Church authorities as for the Christian thinker to work at this problem, for the night cometh when no man can work.

L. W. Barnard.

---

## St George's Training Scheme for Christian Ministry

Throughout the history of the Church there has always been conflict between loyalty to the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth and the adaptation of the Church to contemporary society. The greatest possible challenge has been made to the Church in England with the very rapid development of industrial and technological society. Much has been said and written about bridging the gap between the life of the Church and the life of the secular world. Christ did not think in these terms, but saw himself and his followers as being firmly planted in the world but not of it, working as leaven to radiate the power and the love of God that his Kingdom might be built among men. St George's Training Scheme for Christian Ministry has taken root in the heart of a large industrial town, where it is surrounded by the hectic life of the less respectable side of the town centre.

The founder members of the Scheme, a priest and a skilled engineer, both considered that the Church had not sufficient understanding of industrial society. The priest had virtually no knowledge of industry, and the layman had but a hazy idea of the doctrines of the Church. Both were ready to find that they had misjudged the environment with which they were not conversant, both were ready to learn from the beginning, and neither of them expected an institution which has been used by hundreds of people to emerge from their studies. What the priest came to realize was that the practical aspect of God's love for man as revealed in Jesus Christ meant that he must identify himself with all sorts and conditions of men in factories, homes, offices and shops, so that he might try to understand contemporary life in various industrial areas. The layman, having accepted a disciplined life of prayer and sacramental worship whilst striving to understand the doctrine of the Incarnation, learned to appreciate that Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, to-day and for ever, and that all aspects of life can be identified with the sacrifice of Calvary. And together they began to understand what is now summed up in the motto of St George's House: "Men of prayer and action are the strongest people in the world, for these are the only unbeatable combinations."

The result of this period of apprenticeship was a series of talks and discussions at the beginning of 1954 in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge to persuade men destined for the ministry of the

Church of England that they must be prepared to study the life of the community in which they would be working. A derelict little terrace dwelling, 683 Parkfield Road, was purchased as a House to which university men could come to learn something of industrial society. The first group arrived in the summer, and since then the corporate life has never been broken. The first pioneers—all convinced Christians—lived as a community, sharing the financial and domestic responsibilities of the House, and worked in different types of factories at unskilled or semi-skilled jobs. Their purpose was not to evangelize, nor to instruct, but to learn; each could testify to something he has gained from this experience. As well as working on the shopfloor, men were given the opportunity every week of meeting other people from industry and discussing the various aspects of industrial life. This made men aware of the deep thought and prayer needed to relate the direct teaching of the Gospel to a complex system of business.

Although the Training Scheme had evolved through an industrial chaplaincy it was never intended to train industrial specialists. Domestic, working and social life cannot be divorced from one another. The parish clergy are in a unique position to lead people through the complexities of divided loyalties, commitments and strains of modern society. To do this they require some knowledge and experience of industry and commerce, the ability to think objectively with courage about society as a whole, and patience and sympathy to share the burden of individuals who may often appear to be both ignorant and unsympathetic towards the Church.

At the end of the first three months a conference was held to discuss the future of this experiment. It was attended by a wide variety of people of different denominations and who ranged in status from managerial level to semi-skilled coloured workers, as well as the Household. They included a Roman Catholic trade union leader and a Congregationalist deacon. The verdict of this conference was that the House must go on with a twofold purpose: first, ordinands must be given experience and understanding of industry and the life and problems of industrial society; and second, people within that society must be encouraged to see that the Church cared about secular things and had something relevant to say regarding daily life and work. It is hoped that some of these people will eventually be prepared to give themselves to the Redemptive Life which the Scheme is striving to work out.

As a result, the Community was transferred to St George's Church, and the vicarage became known as St George's House. This was obviously difficult for the existing members of the congregation to understand and accept. Certain adaptations had to be made in the life and worship of the church. Although there was a long tradition of Anglo-Catholic teaching and worship, various circumstances had reduced the number of communions per week to less than fifty, in spite of a daily celebration, and all the congregation except four lived outside the parish. The area surrounding the church was the focal point for the sad flotsam and jetsam of humanity which congre-

gates near the centre of every large industrial town. For the most part the busy life of the town—the teddy boys, prostitutes and vagrants—passed by unnoticed, and the Body and Blood of Jesus were offered daily at the altar unreceived except by a faithful few. This is true of many churches in the centre of industrial towns, and it is what Jesus foretold of the years ahead: "Because iniquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold." But "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son . . . that the world through him might be saved", and he still gives him in us and through us as the living members of his Body within industrial society. This meant that the offertory of the individual life within the life of the worshipping community had to regain its rightful place. The practice of a non-communicating Mass as the main act of worship of the week was dropped and replaced by a Sung Communion. Those who really meant to witness for Christ at their places of work were also encouraged to identify their daily living with the sacrifices of the altar during the week. The one strong link between the ideals of St George's House and the life of St George's Church is the ever-increasing number of people who begin at least one working day by receiving the Holy Food to strengthen them as his disciples at their places of work.

Because of the position of the House all kinds of men in trouble began to come for help. Out of Christian charity it was clear that a few of these men must be allowed to share the life of the House and through it to be rehabilitated. It is now an essential part of the whole scheme that the House is never exclusive; ordinands and all kinds of people live together on a basis of family equality; the only distinction being that the convinced Christians are obliged to share the spiritual discipline, whereas others are completely free to accept or reject it. Nobody can live here as a mere lodger. It has been proved that such communal living is as valuable to ordinands as their experience as workers in industry. One of the defects of life at Parkfield Road was that men could identify themselves with workmates during the day and escape to an "ivory shack" of intellectual or spiritual remoteness in the evening.

The most important work of the House, as far as the ordinands are concerned, is to give them respect and sensitivity towards all kinds of people. As far as other members of the House are concerned, they need respect and sensitivity towards themselves so that they are encouraged to fulfil their rightful place in society. Mutual respect and self-respect emerge through family life together. Friendships within the Household reveal a great deal, and what a man is, soon counts for more than what he has done, or what he thinks ought to be. There is no room for the professional doer of good.

The maximum capacity of the House is fifteen, but the average throughout the year is ten. The family atmosphere of the House depends principally on two things: first, simple family prayers at 6.30 every morning in the House chapel; and second, the sense of responsibility which everyone has for contributing to the family. This is brought out in the simple offertory service after supper on a

Friday night, which is the one act of worship which everyone has to attend irrespective of belief; thus any idea of St George's being a lodging house rather than a community house in the fullest sense is removed.

In theory the House should be self-supporting, but the ever-changing numbers, the amount of hospitality given to visitors, and the subsidizing of most men during the first fortnight, and most teenagers continually, makes this impossible. The House is dependent upon the generosity of friends and old members for approximately 20 per cent of the annual running expenditure. It is also hoped that if enough capital can be raised a more economical and effective heating system could be installed, which would also make it possible to convert waste cellar space into a well-equipped workshop. This is vital here, for many men need the opportunity to develop practical gifts or to regain lost ability. The inability of all kinds of people to occupy or express themselves in this age of superficial entertainment is a contributing factor to instability and delinquency. Within the limitations of the House its members are encouraged to maintain their individual characteristics and interests, and also to bring their friends and workmates to the House. There is usually a variety of pets belonging to different people, and the latest penance the more studious are having to suffer is the formation of a skiffle group by one young member with his friends.

The ideal period for an ordinand or a man who wishes to test his vocation to stay here is about a year. Ordinands can sometimes be taken for monthly periods if they are able to pay their way without earning a wage while they are here. Some of the local State departments, such as the Probation Service, are willing to give men some insight into conditions and problems, and it is possible that this could also be arranged with the personnel departments of large companies. The length of time other people should stay with us varies enormously according to their backgrounds, their needs and their age. Whatever the duration of their stay, the Community tries to give them friendship, opportunity for the right kind of employment, stability within that employment, and encouragement to return to broken domestic circumstances or to settle on their own. Close liaison with the Welfare State is extremely important from every point of view, not least to the ordinands who will need to use these State facilities in their own pastoral work. It is also encouraging that various State officials whose work overlaps are brought together through the House.

Apart from the rule of life for Christians there are virtually no rules and no rotas. This inevitably means that the practising Christian has to shoulder the weaknesses of those who have no belief to spur them on to a life of service. When they maintain their example, others invariably begin to think and to respond. This makes St George's House an ideal environment in which to test one's vocation to the ministry.

It is considered that the House could be of more service to those who are rejected for ordination by selection boards. There has also

been some concern for the lack of opportunity given to young men who left school at fifteen to test possible vocations. Many men and boys in offices and works have gifts of virile, sympathetic leadership which are being lost to the Church because there are few opportunities for them to discover the essence of ministry and sacrificial living. These men will never be academics, and a disservice is done to the Church by trying to fit them into the pattern of traditional Anglican clergymen. We still need the intellect of St Paul, the shrewdness of St Matthew, and the loving spirituality of St John, but we also need the impetuous enthusiasm of St Peter and the humble service of St Andrew. From experience gained through this Scheme it is felt that there could be, and should be, a far wider opportunity for men who are below the present level of academic requirements for the ordained ministry, but who know their Bible thoroughly, have experience of life within industrial society and who could be trained in pastoral theology. From among such men could be drawn recruits for experiments in the use of the priest-worker and the staffing of clergyhouses in industrial areas.

Much has been said in this article about the ordained ministry, but it is implicit in the scheme that ministry is not regarded as synonymous with ordination. There is a dire need for bold experiment in industrial areas along the lines of the Little Brothers and Sisters of de Foucauld.[1] It is hoped that St George's House will eventually attract some of the unlettered leaders of industrial society to consider the life of ministry. These people would provide recruits for community living within the industrial social milieu as a pattern of prayer and action which should be the ideal for all believers. Such corporate living out of the truth of the Gospel follows the pattern of the early Church, when the disciples "continued steadfast in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayers", and "all that believed were together and had all things common". This would seem to be the way to confront prayerless materialism and the indifference of nominal Christianity with the converting truth of the Gospel of Jesus.

Within the St George's Training Scheme for Christian ministry there is a constant search for the best way in which prayerful people can show forth the continuation of the offering of Calvary within the Body of Christ and in the world to-day. It is a search which demands adaptability, for this is the essence of life in an ever-changing Household. And because the Way of Redemption is the Way of the Cross, the God-given answer to the quest of identification can only be known by those who accept the ardour as well as the joy of cross-bearing. Whoever seek to share the work of redeeming industrial society must be prepared to "bear about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in their bodies".

D. A. Wood.

[1] See Theology, April 1952, pp. 127–34.

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. T. R. Milford is Master of the Temple.

Dr Pittenger is Professor of Christian Apologetics at the General Theological Seminary, New York City, and the editorial representative of THEOLOGY in the U.S.A.

The Rev. L. W. Barnard is Vicar of Shaw, Melksham, Wilts.

The Rev. D. A. Wood is Vicar of St George's, Wolverhampton.

# CORRESPONDENCE

## THE CHURCH AND THE FARMING COMMUNITY

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The attention given to "the relative absence of working-class people from the church" (to quote the opening sentence of a recent article in THEOLOGY) has been restricted to such industrial centres as Sheffield (E. R. Wickham's *Church and People in an Industrial City*) and Birmingham. It may be relevant to this discussion to point out that there is a very large "working class" which is not employed in factories or mines, but is engaged in the basic and essential industry of the cultivation of the land, namely the farming community.

After some ten years as a parish priest in a Derbyshire mining district, the writer has for nearly thirty years been a country parson in remote East Suffolk, and may therefore claim to know something about the "relative absence from church" of the farming community. Dr Langmead Casserley has declared that "the unwillingness of the working-class masses to attend public worship dates from the period during which it was impossible for them to do so, for the simple reason that most of them had no church to attend".

The circumstances here are the exact opposite: for generations the farm-workers of East Anglia have had too many churches altogether. Parishes of a few hundreds or of even less than a hundred souls had until recently not only a church but a resident parson, generally occupying an immense parsonage house quite out of keeping with his stipend. But, even then, the parishioners were not by any means regular worshippers, and their church-going was very largely conditional upon their employment by the squire.

The circumstances have changed out of all imagination during the past thirty years. The squire has gone; the estate has been broken up; tenant farmers have become owners; in many cases the great parsonage has been sold and a small modern house has taken its place; parishes have been linked together in twos or threes or even fours, by pluralities or unions of benefices; and the lot of the farm-worker has improved beyond the wildest dreams of the old men. He is housed in a council house, with "the usual amenities" and all the electrical appliances he can afford on hire-purchase. He may have a television set, he may even have a car. And the church means nothing to him whatever, apart from baptisms, weddings, funerals, the har-

vest thanksgiving, and possibly, but by no means certainly, Christmas and Easter. He likes to have a parish church to stay away from, and he will give fairly generously to keep it in repair or to rehang the bells which call him in vain to come and worship. But in parish after parish the incumbent is ministering to a dozen or fewer people Sunday by Sunday.

What shall we say to these things? First, the farming community is not hostile to the parson or the church; it is simply indifferent. As one worker said to his rector: "You can't offer me anything at your church that I want." The attitude is almost entirely materialistic. Hence the popularity of the harvest thanksgiving (which indeed has a very respectable and long history going back to Deuteronomy). The farm worker recognizes a Creator—he would indeed be a fool if he did not—but he has no consciousness of his need of a Redeemer, and he has not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. In short, his belief in the One true God is defective, and because it is defective he does not find his God worthy of his adoration and service. This is all the more strange since until very recent times, following the 1944 Education Act, he has probably been taught in a village church school, and, if the parson has done his duty, he has been instructed in the elements of the Catholic religion. Nevertheless, in his (or her) 'teens the villager will have practically severed any real tie with the worshipping community at the parish church.

It is perhaps a declaration of independence. Thirty and more years ago it was the done thing to go to church. The squire and the local gentry, if any, went to church, and the workers were expected to go too. They went, not out of conviction, but because their livelihood and their homes very possibly depended upon their conformity. Now they are independent, and they please themselves.

If they want religion they can get it out of a box, sitting comfortably at home. At least, they think they can. They are not sacramentally minded, and a "service" is an act of which they are mainly passive spectators and hearers, even if they do go to church.

What hope is there of a revival? The fundamental problem, as I understand it, is to re-create a belief in God. The vague Providence, or One above, "the God-shaped blank in the minds of this generation", as someone has described the remnant of religious belief, compels no one to take God seriously as Maker, Redeemer, Sanctifier and Judge. Only a conversion to the God of the Bible and of Jesus Christ will ever bring the workers back to church and sacraments.

But how this is to be done I do not know. The main difficulty is that the parson and his people are not on the same wave-length at all. Even his simplified theology, his preaching of atonement, of resurrection, of the means of grace and of the hope of glory, is almost meaningless to people who are drunk with entertainment of every kind. Where is he to begin? It is suggested that the Cross is the only possible key to the problem. If he who was crucified is indeed God the Son in human flesh, then even the least intelligent, the most complacent of our villagers must see that they cannot escape the challenge: What think ye of Christ?

This, in conclusion. The task of the country parson is far too frequently underestimated, both in its difficulty, its frustrations and also in its importance. It is no part of this letter to suggest the special training, the special gifts, the special vocation, which ought to be thought of in connexion with work in a village of farm workers, but at least this may be urged upon students of "religion and the working classes": that they give some attention to this peculiarly difficult problem of the farming community.

Yours faithfully,

HOWARD DOBSON.

HUNTINGFIELD RECTORY,
HALESWORTH,
SUFFOLK.

## WYE

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

There are many churches in the country that possess windows filled with Kemp's glass. In most of them will be found a wheatsheaf, as a sort of "trade mark" of the firm. On one of many visits paid to Wye I noticed that a wheatsheaf was part of Archbishop Kemp's Arms. It would be of interest to learn if and when Mr Kemp visited Wye, and whether he had any claim to lineal descent, not of course from the archbishop, but from his family. Mr Kemp's successor was a Mr Tower. In the later windows designed by the firm, a small castle such as is in use in chess was superimposed on the wheatsheaf. It seems fitting that Archbishop Kemp's foundation should have become a centre of agriculture!

Yours faithfully,

E. A. THORNE.

HOMES OF ST BARNABAS, DORMANS.

## THE UNJUST STEWARD

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Surely, if we are trying to interpret a parable—still more if it is in any sense an allegory—the first thing to do is to get the superficial meaning right. Here is a story with a hidden meaning: but first we must interpret the story in itself in a way that will make sense.

Mr Paul writes of "whitewashing" the steward: but why should the poor man, commended by his lord (or, as Mr Paul thinks, by the Lord himself) for wisdom, be denigrated as no more than a fool. Here is a man accused of extravagance in his master's business, probably with justice, as there is to be no doubt about his dismissal; and he is supposed to try to get out of the mess by giving away his master's money and cooking his accounts just when they were going

to be audited. If his fault was wastefulness in what did not belong to him he was only making matters worse. What could be more extravagant than giving away his master's dues? It does not make sense. Surely the only reasonable motive for his action is that by spending some of his own money, and so helping the tradesmen to provide the goods which were due, he can make them contract a debt of gratitude to himself. He will be extravagant once more, but not this time at his master's expense. So the master good humouredly commends his prudence. He has been wasteful and must lose his post, but the master still wishes him well.

So when we come to our Lord's interpretation of the parable he makes the steward the type of a man who has at last learned to be faithful in the use of the "mammon of unrighteousness". "Mammon", as our Lord contemptuously calls it, is not of much value, nor is it ultimately our own. If we use it extravagantly that is no doubt unfaithfulness, and will bring us into God's displeasure. But there is also a sense in which it *is* our own. We can do what we will with it. We can use it for holy and unselfish purposes, and earn other men's love and God's approval. We cannot undo our past sins of bad stewardship, if such there have been, but we can now begin to make a faithful and charitable use of money, time and talents, and so at last enjoy the commendation of our divine Master. If we repent of our previous unfaithfulness, that will be forgiven; and we shall reap the reward of the good deeds which by the grace of God we have been able to perform.

But why should the steward be called "unjust" or "unrighteous"? Perhaps because of his past unfaithfulness: or is it possible that "steward of unrighteousness" means steward of the sordid stuff called "mammon" (in spite of the analogy of the "unjust Judge")?

† Kenneth Mackenzie.

Hove.

---

*To the Editor of* Theology.

Dear Sir,

May I be allowed to bring to the notice or recollection of your readers an unusual interpretation of the above—dear, I imagine, to Mr Wilfrid Browning, though not to the excellent vicar of Woodford—to be found in Henry Latham's old but fine book, *Pastor Pastorum* (pp. 386–98), an interpretation apparently thought of or adopted by no one before him but Calvin?

Yours faithfully,
J. K. Byrom.

The Vicarage,
Cheadle Hulme.

---

## CATECHISM REVISION

*To the Editor of* THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

So the Catechism is to be revised.

I wonder whether the revisers will consider the judgments of Samuel Butler in *The Way of all Flesh*. I quote:

"That work was written too exclusively from the parental point of view; the person who composed it did not get a few children to come in and help him; he was clearly not young himself, nor should I say it was the work of one who liked children—in spite of the words 'my good child', which, if I remember rightly, are once put into the mouth of the catechist, and, after all, carry a harsh sound with them. The general impression it leaves upon the mind of the young is that their wickedness at birth was but very imperfectly wiped out at baptism, and that the mere fact of being young at all has something with it that savours more or less distinctly of the nature of sin. . . . If a new edition of the work is ever required . . . I should like to see children taught that they should not say they like things which they do not like, merely because certain other people say they like them, and how foolish it is to say they believe this or that thing when they understand nothing about it."

May the thorn in the flesh be successfully removed!

Yours sincerely,

ERIC JAMES.

TRINITY COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

---

# BOOK REVIEWS

THE SANCTITY OF LIFE AND THE CRIMINAL LAW. By Glanville Williams. Faber and Faber. 30s.

This book contains a series of eight lectures delivered by Prof. Glanville Williams at Columbia University in 1956. It was first published in U.S.A. and now appears in an English edition with additional references. The author has spread his net in wide and deep waters and states that this "is a book of legal argument, of social history, of philosophy and biblical texts. It is a book about the conflict between the ideals of happiness and holiness; about the way in which morals become entangled with semantics; about the humanitarian impulses of medical men and the anxiety neuroses to which these give rise in the sister professions of theology and law; about the alternate fears of mankind that the human race may dwindle out of existence or fill the planet to the bursting point. . . . The connecting thread is the extent to which human life, actual or potential, is or ought to be protected under the criminal law of the English-speak-

ing peoples" (p. 11). Fortunately the lectures themselves strike a less flamboyant note and the specific problems of contraception, sterilization, artificial insemination, abortion, attempted suicide and euthanasia are treated from the legal, ethical and practical points of view. The evidence is so complicated and the angles from which it is surveyed so varied that it is advisable here merely to state Williams' main conclusions with some critical comment.

He sensibly recommends that in spite of numerous medical and legal complications infanticide in all forms and circumstances should be kept under the aegis of the criminal law, but that wide and flexible discretion be exercised in its enforcement. He maintains rightly that in many cases probation offers opportunities for education and better emotional adjustment than either prison sentences or commitment to hospitals for the criminally insane. The chapter on "The Control of Conception" deals with various devices employed for this purpose and discusses the medical, moral and sociological considerations involved in the prevention of procreation. Williams is obviously in favour of the untrammelled practice of contraception on many grounds. Hereditary factors are not always favourable, the physiological adaptability of women to child-birth is variable and the economic resources of many families are inadequate to provide food, clothing and education for more than a restricted number of children. The danger of over-population in some countries, especially small and unproductive ones, intensifies this problem.

Prof. Williams is least well informed in dealing with Christian ideas. He makes the unfortunate statement that, "if a child died after baptism he was capable of going to heaven; if before, he was condemned at best to eternal death" (p. 28). Nothing could be farther from the truth, for "eternal death" is not a category recognized by Christian theology at all. In the last analysis, whether any soul is destined after death to go to heaven, hell, purgatory, paradise or limbo is dependent on God's will. In Catholic theology unbaptized infants who are incapable of actual sin go to limbo, a state which is conceived in neither punitive nor rewarding terms. It is not even a kind of Catholic nursery, for victims of invincible ignorance, a broad and flexible conception, also are believed to go to limbo. Such a lot may not be enviable but can scarcely be described as "eternal death". Furthermore, the Catholic objection to artificial contraception is that it interferes with the natural operation of instinctive processes ordained by God. The notion of *lex naturae* was not a Catholic invention, but was derived from Aristotle's rigid view of nature which was taken over and developed by the Stoics, who passed it on to Christianity. It may be legitimate to argue that, "from the logical point of view, the permission to use the rhythm method seems to make any further resistance to birth control on the part of the Catholic community difficult to defend" (p. 63), and to point out "that nature evidently intends males to have beards, which intention they steadfastly frustrate by the use of the razor" (p. 65) without ecclesiastical censure. The point is, however, that the use of the rhythm period does not involve interference with the

natural process and, perhaps unreasonably, Roman moral theologians do not regard the entelechy of growing a beard on a par with rearing a family. Admittedly the Aristotelian and Catholic views of nature are tidier and less flexible than nature itself, but the serious disagreement between Williams and the Roman theologians is on premises rather than on their development.

The lecture on sterilization is little more than a summary of the practice and of the various theories entertained on this vexed question. The crux of the legal and moral problem is the possibility of determining consent and applying it to the wide range of individual and social issues involved in so grave and irreparable an act. The chapter on artificial insemination is particularly timely, as it has recently been mooted in lively fashion by theologians and lawyers. It is difficult to see why—if the consent of both parties be assured—any legal problem should arise, except perhaps in connexion with inheritance and occasionally custody. The theological difficulties concern the permissibility of masturbation for any purpose and the requirement that nature should run its course in such matters, whatever that course may be. There are also certain eugenic considerations, but too little is known to aid firm decision. Obviously a doctor's advice should be an important factor in enterprises of this kind.

Two lectures are devoted to abortion, which is not surprising in view of the complexity of the problem. Law, theology and medicine are sharply divided in their views on this subject, and the laws of different countries on broadly the same level of culture differ widely. The danger of abortion to the mother after three months of pregnancy constitutes a medical difficulty. The point at which human life acquires a spiritual significance has received more than one theological answer and the encouragement to sexual licence, if its practical consequences can be avoided, has often been pressed in arguments against this hazardous practice. Williams has wisely confined himself to a statement of the facts and of current opinions. There would appear to be no likelihood of agreement on an issue on which so many different factors converge.

The last two lectures deal with the criminality of attempted suicide and with euthanasia. Public feeling on the former has changed considerably in recent times, as has been evinced by recent correspondence in *The Times*. Except in Roman Catholic circles it is now generally recognized that the impulse to take one's life is an indication of serious mental disturbance, and when acted on unsuccessfully presents a psychiatric rather than a moral or legal problem. The obvious reasons for suicide are seldom the real ones, or at the most are only partial explanations of the act. Many attempts are consciously or unconsciously designed to fail and most are animated by an inverted hostility. Euthanasia is a much more difficult matter. There is widespread sentiment in favour of sparing intense pain at the expense of prolonged existence, but there is abundant case material to prove how easily such a practice can be abused and for what sordid ends.

Prof. Williams is to be congratulated for bringing important and timely questions into the open. All of them have invited the discursive treatment he has given them, and it is therefore not the author's fault if his book leaves his readers with a certain sense of incoherence and inconclusiveness.

Robert P. Casey.

Sidney Sussex College,
Cambridge.

---

Puritan Devotion. By G. S. Wakefield. Epworth Press. 21s.
The Holy Pretence. By George L. Mosse. Basil Blackwell. 21s.

In his Fernley-Hartley Lecture for 1957 Mr Wakefield has presented a volume to which John Wesley would have been happy to write a commendatory foreword. And that for three reasons: it has been prepared by one who is engaged in the pastoral ministry; it is an example of careful scholarship adapted to a practical and eirenic purpose; and its subject matter reminds us that there is an important strain in the Methodist tradition which looks back with pride to the seventeenth century.

After an introduction in which the author explains the principles which have determined his choice of material, there follow eight succinct chapters which give an outline survey of the whole range of Puritan spirituality: the use and authority of the Scriptures in private devotions, in preaching and commentary, and in the life of the believer; the doctrine of the Church and Sacraments, especially the Lords' Supper; the observance of the Lord's Day, public worship, and the conception of the household as a religious community; the doctrine and practice of private prayer in all its parts; the ideals of the pastoral office, spiritual direction, and the resolution of cases of conscience; perseverance against temptation, growth in grace, and the hope of perfection; preparation for death, and beliefs about the future state. For the most part, Mr Wakefield is content with plain exposition; but at various points in these eight chapters, as also in his final summing up, he makes wise comments and allows himself a few shrewd thrusts. Thus, when alluding to Dr Dillistone's judgment on the Puritan attitude to time, he comments: "Here is the analytic and philosophic theologian writing without any reference to actual Church History" (p. 62). With the evidence before him, he takes up R. H. Tawney's galloping exaggeration with the remark: "They did not conceive of the Christian life as a joyless journey through 'a forbidding and frost-bound wilderness rolling its snow-clad leagues towards the grave'" p. 131). When writing of the contrast with "Catholic" devotion, he observes: "The Catholic may have more in common with the good pagan than has the Puritan, and may on the whole find it easier to approach God through nature, while the Puritan approaches nature through God" (p. 162). And when describing the aim of Puritan casuistry, he adds: "Modern liberal Christians have spoken of religion as being co-extensive with life, and of Christ as the Lord of every realm. It may be doubted whether

they have made as thorough-going an attempt to relate the Gospel to the whole of living as the Puritans, whom posterity has maligned as narrow and tyrannical" (p. 157).

Although Mr Wakefield devotes the major part of chapter seven to a description of Puritan casuistry, he has little to say about its political implications. It is precisely this important aspect of the subject which has been investigated by the Associate Professor of History at Wisconsin in *The Holy Pretence*; its sub-title is "A Study in Christianity and Reason of State from William Perkins to John Winthrop". It was an inquiry well worth the undertaking, though Prof. Mosse's handling of it is somewhat disappointing. The theme is, admittedly, an exceedingly intricate one, but some of the confusion in Prof. Mosse's pages appear to arise from an imperfect grasp of the technical language used by the casuists whose work he analyses. At any rate, in a serious study of casuistical divinity, sentences like the following are enough to shake one's confidence: "Those sins which are the gravest are voluntary sins; that is, implying the consent of the will" (p. 58: but how else can a sin be voluntary?); "It can surely no longer be argued that probabiliorism was either a Catholic monopoly or a Jesuit invention of the seventeenth century" (p. 81: but no one has ever attributed the invention of *probabiliorism* to the Jesuits!); "The title of one of his principal works, *The Serpent and the Dove . . .*" (p. 133: but this is *not* one of Jeremy Taylor's principal works, but simply Sermons xx–xxii from the second part of the Ἐνιαυτὸς, *or Course of Sermons for all the Sundays of the Year*); "Sanderson may have had sympathy for the Jesuit distinction between mortal and venial sin . . ." (p. 143: but the truth is the exact opposite, as the article cited in the footnote is concerned to show!).

William Perkins has a celebrated case of conscience, "The greatest that ever was; how a man may know whether he be the child of God or no", and Mr Wakefield remarks that it is in this kind of discussion about personal assurance of salvation that the distinctively Puritan contribution to casuistry is to be found (p. 124). In a sense this is undoubtedly true, but I wonder whether it would not be even truer to say that it was only the Puritans who posed the question *in this particular form*? He emphasizes that in resolving it they "did not appeal to subjective feelings or voices that may deceive . . . it is never an assurance of salvation irrespective of manner of life" (p. 125); and I would throw out the suggestion that a closer study of the terms in which the *answer* to that question is given might reveal a closer correspondence than is often suspected with the more orthodox question of what it means to be in a true *state of repentance* (as distinct from making a particular act of penitence.)

In a survey of such an enormous literature within the space of 164 pages many things have to be said summarily. But brevity has its dangers. Thus, it is rather misleading to say simply that Perkins would have no truck with sacramental confession (p. 146), or to quote Baxter's remark on mortal and venial sin without further explanation (p. 113), or to say without qualification that the Puritans

condemned gaming because a mortal man is not the absolute lord of his money (p. 121). Similarly, you cannot give an adequate indication of the Puritan (or any other) attitude to the dissolution of marriage, or their approach to the difficult moral problems of lying and war in passages of less than one page each! There is a great deal more to be said about them, as I am sure Mr Wakefield would readily agree. And certainly, in general, despite the rehabilitation of the English Puritans which has now been going on for some time on both sides of the Atlantic, there is still a great deal more that needs to be said in order to eradicate that gross caricature of them which still persists in the popular mind and has been fostered by writers who can hardly have taken the trouble to read their works.

THOMAS WOOD.

LAMPETER.

---

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES. By Kenneth N. Ross. Mowbrays. 5s.
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, ITS MEMBERS AND ITS BUSINESS. By Guy Mayfield. Oxford University Press. 18s.

These present times are remarkable, among other things, for the number of books about the Church of England to which they are giving birth. Both the books here under review belong to this category. The one deals with a document which has seldom enthused and not seldom embarrassed members of the Church of England. The other tells chiefly of those members engaged in a part of their duties which even they who find meetings congenial are seldom so unfashionable as openly to relish.

Many an incumbent will on his first Sunday in the parish have set out to read the Articles of Religion with a sigh and then discovered with surprise not only that they are a joy to read but that the congregation was savouring them. Whatever else they may or may not be, the Articles are certainly what Mr A. P. Herbert in *What a Word!* has called "Good Stuff". But also, one suspects, the descendants of those who bequeathed them to us have not entirely failed to inherit a taste for theological niceties. Here is certainly grand and economical prose. Here is also perhaps more precision than the Vicar of All Saints, Margaret Street, might lead us to think. The English, now assisted by the device of italics, have always been adepts at the art of so handling the phrases of the past as to render them not merely innocuous but fruitful for their present purposes. Magna Carta is the classical example of this. That at times, when one was reading Mr Ross, one could see Tudor eyebrows rising does not condemn his essay, and that the Spirit should have called him (with a considerable Reformation erudition) to undertake it is happily significant.

There was recently a kind of Anglo-Catholicism which, to employ the expressive language put into the mouth of a Russian savant by Mr P. G. Wodehouse, could do nothing but "spit me" of the Reformation. It wrote, for instance, guide books to our counties which swallowed the late Cardinal Gasquet whole. Rather then than list

the points at which ancestral eyebrows seemed to rise, one will record the pleasure which one sensed in their owners at being appreciated with a new seriousness here. It is much to be hoped that this book will be read by both Anglo-Catholics and others, whose idea of Anglo-Catholicism still belongs to an age which is passing. The others may feel that to place Infant Baptism and Fasting Communion side by side within the same bracket at the least demands from those, who wish thus to equate them in authority, the answer which has not yet been forthcoming to Dr Dearmer's *The Truth about Fasting* (1928).

That the Archdeacon of Hastings has not been entirely successful in subjecting himself to the inhuman discipline of an "objective treatment" of the Church of England, which he proposes for himself in his preface, makes his book a great deal the more readable. It is indeed largely factual and considerably statistical, and, alas, how soon statistics (as every shopper knows) and even administrative facts cease to be quite contemporary! But many readers, while they admire the herculean labour that has gone to produce so compendious an account of the business of the Church of England, will find the member of the Church of England who keeps peeping out through it more engaging. Here we can yawn and feel frustrated with Mr Mayfield at a diocesan conference, and some of us not share the extent of his faith in formal education. Here we can regret with him that the diocesan bishop, as residuary legatee of almost every new regulation, becomes steadily more monarchical at the very time when we are engaged in hopeful conversation with those who will never stomach bishops out of presbytery.

But this is a remarkable book for the sheer scope of the information which it provides. Among the subjects of its chapters are the Establishment of the Church, the Territorial Organization of the Church, Bishops and their Officers, the Parochial Clergy, the Laity, and it goes on to describe how the clergy are paid, diocesan, parochial and central administration, the Ecclesiastical Courts and Canon Law, the Church's place in education, the Anglican Communion. Truth to tell, we should view with some terror a member of the Parochial Church Council, who had mastered its contents, but we shall keep it on our own shelves for useful reference. It is perhaps, though C.A.C.T.M. is not at the time of writing a department of the Church Assembly (p. 130), more satisfactory in dealing with contemporary administration than with history. The time has come when the dislike, even on the part of such good cows as the medieval English, of being milked for the Civil Service of Avignon should cease to be interpreted as the first mooings against the Papacy as Papacy. Ought not the national synod which an Archbishop of Canterbury is said (p. 121) to have called to Hereford in A.D. 637 to be that at which Archbishop Theodore presided over a disappointing attendance at Hertford in A.D. 673?

FRANK BENNETT.

MAIDSTONE.

ENTERPRISE IN EDUCATION. By H. J. Burgess. National Society and S.P.C.K. 25s.

This book has as its sub-title "The Story of the Work of the Established Church in the Education of the People prior to 1870". It opens with a brief sketch of the history of English education from early times to the close of the eighteenth century, but its main theme is the educational work of the Church of England from the foundation of the National Society in 1811 to the passing of the Elementary Education Act of 1870. In a foreword commending the book the Archbishop of Canterbury says that a second volume by Dr S. J. Curtis, Reader in Education in the University of Leeds, is in course of preparation and this will cover the period from 1870 onwards. Together these two books will fill an important gap in our educational literature, for justice has never been done to the work of the National Society or to the Church's contribution to education in modern times. "It is strange," as the Archbishop truly observes, "that so instructive and stimulating a story has not before been fully told."

The author of this first volume is Schools Adviser to the Diocese of Rochester, and his book is based upon two theses submitted in turn for the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees of the University of London. He has spent laborious days to good purpose examining the copious records of the National Society, and made a close study of other relevant contemporary sources. Meticulous research in muniment rooms, especially with a thesis as first objective, has its dangers. "The mind of the historical student," Asquith once said, "is, indeed, in more danger than that of any other scholar of becoming a kind of pantechnicon, in which every sort of furniture is heaped and packed together." This book is no pantechnicon. Dr Burgess has mastered his material, using it to give substance to the record of achievement and failure that he unfolds. Too often the story has been presented as mainly a dismal tale of sectarian strife with Andrew Bell for the National Society and Joseph Lancaster for the British and Foreign School Society as the principal combatants. Contention there certainly was, not only between supporters of the two great Societies but also with the State; and there were divisive conflicts within the Church. But what a false picture we get if we make too much of this!

In his Bampton Lectures on *Christian Education,* Dr Spencer Leeson outlined the true picture with a masterly touch—the pitiful inadequacy of available schooling, the new cities growing "round furnace and factory", the rapidly increasing population, the State slumbering, and for the first time the Christian assumption "challenged in the field of general speculation and then, following necessarily upon that, in education". The need for Christian leadership in education was urgent, and the response was the founding of the National Society, and three years later the British and Foreign School Society. There was rivalry and there was strife; and the monitorial system which the Societies championed, in their different ways, was a cheap, mechanical method of teaching. But for all that it is a heroic story of magnificent achievement against formidable odds. Those earnest, devoted pioneers who founded and fostered the

National Society provided the Church with a vigorous educational policy at a time when the Convocations were in abeyance, saw to it that good training colleges were established, and stimulated countless men and women throughout England and Wales to set to work in their parishes and build schools for which there was such a desperate need. Dr Burgess is to be congratulated on doing justice to this story which, as the Archbishop says in his foreword, "is a splendid one even when it reveals failures and shortcomings".

W. O. Lester Smith.

---

## SHORTER NOTICES

The Pastoral Epistles. By D. Guthrie. Tyndale Press. 9s. 6d.

St Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians. By W. Neil. S.C.M. Press (Torch Commentary). 10s. 6d.

The Epistle of James. By E. C. Blackman. S.C.M. Press (Torch Commentary). 10s. 6d.

Saint Paul. By Claude Tresmontant. Longmans. 6s.

In the last ten years two eminent New Testament scholars on the continent, Fr Spicq and Prof. Jeremias, have maintained in their commentaries the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, and it was to be hoped that somebody would be found to reopen the question in this country. This at least Mr Guthrie has done. But he has, in addition, written a commentary of rather more than 200 pages which is careful in scholarship and sensibly related to the lives of practising Christians to-day.

All the familiar arguments against Pauline authorship are in turn considered and rejected, either in the introduction or the body of the commentary, though the author is notably more successful in dealing with the linguistic and stylistic problems than with questions like, "Is it really probable that Timothy, after ten years' service with the apostle, would need to be warned against 'youthful passions' (2 Tim. 2. 22) or given instruction in the rudiments of prayer (1 Tim. 2)?" Guthrie merely says that Timothy was still young enough to need such advice. But was he? Then it is odd that the sufferings of St Paul, which are explicitly mentioned, are just those that occurred before Timothy's call. How did he "observe" them? As a youth in Lystra, replies Guthrie; and what he saw was perhaps responsible for his attachment to the apostle. Or if it is alleged that the Holy Spirit has little meaning for the author of these epistles—so unlike St Paul—it can be shown that likewise in Colossians the Holy Spirit makes but one fleeting occurrence (and in Philemon never).

Mr Guthrie is disarmingly frank in admitting the difficulties which face his traditional view, and most people will continue to feel the force of these cumulatively. But equally he has exposed the uncer-

tainties of Dr P. N. Harrison's mathematical calculations. ("Accidently" on p. 73 is a barbarism.)

Mr Neil is already known to have a flair for presenting biblical studies in non-technical language, and this his second commentary on the Thessalonian correspondence (the first was in the Moffatt series) is as good as one had expected. The commentary is broken up into about two paragraphs to every page and the substance of each paragraph is indicated by a brief heading, the letters being printed larger for a wholly new theme. The book is thus admirably arranged alike for daily meditations or for continuous reading, and in either case Mr Neil will not let us forget what St Paul (who is regarded as the author of *both* epistles) is saying to the Church in 1958.

Mr Blackman demands greater application from his readers but makes a definite contribution in the understanding of the Epistle of James, on which little enough work has been done in this country. (Dr J. H. Ropes's standard commentary was published in 1916 and has only once been reprinted.) The view taken here of the composition of James is largely that of Dr Wilfred Knox; that is, an original core is by James, the Lord's brother, and this has been worked up by someone at home in Hellenistic culture, using the common stock of Christian catechetical instruction. On the religious value of the epistle, Mr Blackman remarks upon the absence of anything approaching 1 Cor. 13 or 1 John 4. "But he does say some things which it was not given to Paul and John to say: simple things for the ordinary member who is not interested in theology, has no deep religious experience, and yet feels called to be faithful in that which is least: who asks for no spiritual banquet, but is content with a diet of straw!"

The last of these books is a popular French Catholic book translated by Mr Donald Attwater, which of course means that it is very well translated indeed. The many scriptural quotations are given in the Knox version. There are photographs on almost every page of events in St Paul's life or aspects of his teaching as they have been depicted down the ages in Christian art. For the price it is a remarkable publishing achievement. St Paul's thought is expounded without reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews, and a second imprisonment at Rome followed by martyrdom may be presumed "if the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles be admitted". The bibliography (a bit thin) carries over a slip from the French: but the French *Nihil obstat* is missing. "Only a crooked mind can find any opposition between James's thought and Paul's" could be compared with Blackman on James 2. 24: "This is so diametrically opposed to the conclusion Paul draws that it is difficult to deny that it is a deliberate contradiction of Paul."

Wilfrid Browning.

Cuddesdon College.

Qu'est-ce qu'un Saint? By Jacques Douillet. Qu'est-ce que la Bible? By Daniel-Rops. Hindouisme ou Sanatana Dharma. By Solange Lemaître. Abbayes et Cathédrales. By L. Lefrançois-Pillion. Histoire de la Musique Chrétienne. By Alfred Colling. "Je sais, je crois" Series. Paris: Fayard. 300 francs each.

The publishers claim that the series of which the volumes listed above are samples will be the most complete and most simple of encyclopedias for a Christian public. In 150 small volumes "everything that a Catholic may want to know about any subject connected with his religion" is, they claim, given clear and intelligible exposition. Certainly the fourteen sections of the series display an impressive breadth and comprehensiveness. There are volumes on the extent of human knowledge, the relations of science and faith, the means of salvation, the Bible background, the history of the Church, the problem of Church and State, Christian art and letters, heresy, schism, and non-Christian religions. It is perhaps fortunate that nobody will be set the task of reading through all 150 volumes! For what a queer junk shop that would make of his mind! In some volumes the smattering offered is altogether too rudimentary. On the other hand, in others—in, for instance, the one devoted to abbeys and cathedrals—the bold outline of the text and diagrammatic straightforwardness of the drawings are admirable. It would be instructive to see the volume on Anglicanism and that on "Gnosis", including "guénonisme". Twenty-four volumes have so far appeared.

Montgomery Belgion.

---

Origen. The Song of Songs, Commentary and Homilies. Translation and Notes by R. P. Lawson. Volume 26 in the series "Ancient Christian Writers". Longmans. 21s.

English readers owe to Mr Lawson a first rendering of those Commentary-books and Homilies of Origen on the Song of Songs that survive, three books of the Commentary in the Latin version of Rufinus, and two Homilies as rendered for Pope Damasus by Jerome. The fragments of the Greek Commentary of Procopius are given in English under the relevant places in the text in the form of footnotes.

The rendering will certainly enable the English reader to get a view of that strange process by which Origen ordered his thoughts about spiritual life in the Christian Church by plucking such symbolism out of Scripture as forwarded his purpose, and in such wise as to appear to be finding his thoughts hidden in the biblical text. Very high ideals, both for the Church and the spiritual Christian, are here the result, making the publication of this volume the more welcome.

This volume raises again the question of the policy that should govern the annotation of these translations for the general reader. The tendency is for the translator, as here, to put down the notes he has made for himself, rarely addressing himself to the need of the unlearned. For example, nothing in the subject-matter is likely to

surprise and perplex such readers more than the bride addressing her lover as "nephew". Origen's explanation is translated on pp. 163 and 287, but it is in terms of the suitability of the appellation to serve his purpose. The reader's surprise is over its presence in the text of the Song of Songs. Why does the Septuagint here render "nephew", when in Is. 5. 1 it renders the same Hebrew word "beloved" (*agapetos*), as does Symmachus in the Song of Songs? Why did Aquila and Jerome both think that some family relationship was implied in the word, though they chose more probable relationships than nephew? Origen only reached the sense of "nephew" by assuming *adelphidos* to be the same as *adelphidous*. At least it would have helped the general reader to grasp the artificiality of Origen's art if he had a note to show him how boldly Origen built upon how dubious a rendering! Note 24, p. 366 (which repeats note 51 on p. 363) hardly does this. There is a subject index containing "nephew". The last figure under this head should be 287, and 163 should be inserted before it.

Mr Lawson's volume does not seem to invite any harsher kind of criticism than this.

W. Telfer.

Faversham.

---

The Geography of the Bible. By Denis Baly. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

A very competent and observant geographer, who has lived and taught in Palestine for fifteen years, gives us a full and readable textbook on the geography of the region from Mt Hermon to the Red Sea, and from the Mediterranean to the Transjordanian plateau. This book gives remarkable value for its astonishingly low cost. The region is discussed as a whole from several points of view—geological, climatic, political and so on—and then it is taken piece-meal, each small area being thoroughly analysed. The writer reproduces nearly a hundred of his own photographs, many of which illustrate striking geological boundaries or show examples of types of landscape. He has a good eye for the military aspect of Palestinian geography. His language, though technical, is clear. He is careful not to attempt to convey too much information in each map, and so gives us a great number of small ones (fifty), with clear detail and good lettering in each.

Since this book is likely to run into more than one edition, some criticism is here offered which might help to improve it still further. Some use of colour in a few of the more complicated maps would make them clearer, and an index to the maps should certainly be provided so that places referred to in the text could be easily located. The very difficult matter of orthography has been bravely but unsuccessfully tackled, and the same place is not infrequently referred to by slightly different names on adjacent pages, and once even in the same sentence (Bethshan and Beth-shean, p. 150). Most of the maps are well positioned in relation to the letterpress, but

some need rearranging (e.g. map 29). A modern political map would be a great help, as modern boundaries are occasionally referred to. A few photographs could be improved by re-touching, especially where the horizons are not clearly defined. So many plants and animals of the region are carefully discussed that it is strange to find no mention of the locust, despite its great economic importance and its frequent appearance in the Old Testament. The problem of water storage is not systematically dealt with, nor is the relative purity of water supplies referred to.

In these days, when the "project method" is much in vogue in teaching, it is to be hoped that school and training-college chaplains will interest the geographers and historians on their staffs in this book. It deserves a wide sale.

Alan Rogers.

Ambatoharanana,
Madagascar.

---

For Men of Action. By Yves de Montcheuil, S.J. Geoffrey Chapman. 11s.

Father de Montcheuil, who died at the hands of the Gestapo in Paris in 1944, was generally regarded as one of the more brilliant young French theologians. He was a teacher at the Institut Catholique and spiritual guide to many students at the Sorbonne. After his death a number of articles were found among his papers which so far seem not to have been published in book form in France. This book comes from an American translation, which is, to say the least, undistinguished.

Nevertheless, these essays are precious; they reveal a lucid theological mind informed in holy wisdom engaged in that most necessary of contemporary tasks, the formulation of a lay "spirituality" that does not presuppose the cloister at every turn. Fr de Montcheuil speaks of the apostolate and its aim, so often subtly vitiated, to obtain a *free* response from men, by which alone God is glorified; he speaks of a Christian's vocation, his self-commitment, his asceticism and concludes with some wise words on Christian Humanism.

Victor de Waal.

Ely.

---

The Lost Gods of England. By Brian Branston. Thames and Hudson. 25s.

*Parturiunt montes*—to produce a rather disappointing baby. "We have to reach a symbiotic relationship with all else in the world, living or dead" (p. 191). It is a limited objective: if it is a final objective the author is preaching pantheism. But it is a tame conclusion to a book which has both learning and lore.

Mr Branston wants us to learn a lesson from our ancestors, and so make our peace with life. But did those ancestors make their peace with life? Their gods, as he describes them, certainly did not even in their prime: their myths show courage and a rough loyalty, but

peace was lost when Balder died—and this book gives no real evidence of an English belief in his resurrection. The gods are dead, and if they come to life again it is no longer as gods but demons: Dr Jung has told us that.

Our ancestors—Saxons, Angles and Jutes—brought their gods with them; *but they were no good on foreign soil.* Invading tribes in Africa have found this true (cf. 2 Kings 17. 26). Pagan gods have a certain validity for their own tribe and age and country. Apart from these they are only echoes of an ancient minstrelsy, ministers of a barren nostalgia. From them our forefathers turned not to the great stone circles but to the White Christ, in whom (to Mr Branston's indignation) they found Balder and all the great shadows of Midgard re-presented in terms of an eternal goodness, an unfading beauty and an all-including truth.

Mr Branston's arguments do not always carry conviction, even in his own sphere; the lost gods of England are still dim and doubtful figures. He apparently suggests that Tiwaz (Tiw) was the original Allfather, deposed by Odinn (pp. 69 ff., though what he means by Sky Father is not quite clear); but if Tiwaz answers to Zeus, he too was a usurper, and probably the obscure Ullr or Wuldor answers to Uranus. It is important to realize that there may have been belief, in Europe as elsewhere, in One God—from whom there came a separation and a fall—after which the One was only accessible through the Many. Mr Branston twice says that for the Jews Yahweh was "never immanent in nature but transcended nature" (pp. 74, 182): Yahweh was both immanent and transcendent, revealed in creation but not limited by it; from this the incarnation is a logical consequence.

This is an honest book, but a strange and sad one symptomatic of the age, resentful of the Christian claim to comprehend all partial truths in a final revelation.

Southbroom, Devizes. H. A. Blair.

---

A Little Book of Hours for Housewives. By Anne Z. Forsythe. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

This is a revised edition of a booklet originally published in the U.S.A. as a help to the practice of the Presence of God. It might well be useful for some people, but it would seem to be too elaborate for the really busy housewife with small children, and the housewife with more time would probably do better with the traditional Day Hours of the Church or with the Anglican Mattins and Evensong.

Papworth Everard. Margaret E. Hill.

---

The April 1958 number of *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (Faber and Faber, 18s.) contains articles by Mr W. E. Tate on "The Charity Sermons, 1704–1732, as a Source for the History of Education", and by Dr G. G. Willis on "The Historical Background of the English Lectionary of 1955".

# BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Ivor Leclerc, *Whitehead's Metaphysics* (21s.); N. V. Banerjee, *Concerning Human Understanding* (30s.).

A. AND C. BLACK: K. L. Schmidt, H. Kleinknecht, K. G. Kuhn and G. Von Rad, *Basileia* (8s. 6d.); W. Foerster and G. Quell, *Lord* (12s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: E. I. J. Rosenthal, *Political Thought in Medieval Islam* (35s.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: Dennis J. Geaney, *You are not Your Own* [on living the Christian life in the world, addressed to American Roman Catholics] (6s. 6d.); Peter-Thomas Rohrbach, O.C.D., *Conversation with Christ* (12s. 6d.).

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY (MADRAS): H. Pakenham-Walsh, *Lights and Shades of Christendom* [Vol. III, dealing with the period 1556 to the present day] (Rs 8).

DOUBLEDAY: William J. Wolf, *No Cross, no Crown* ($3.75).

ÉDITIONS DU SEUIL: Claude Tresmontant, *La Doctrine Morale* (frs 600); Henri Peltier, *Histoire du Carmel* (n.p.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Kenneth Grayston, *The Epistles to the Galatians and to the Philippians* (9s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: Daniel Jenkins, *The Protestant Ministry* (12s. 6d.).

FAITH PRESS: F. L. Wheeler, *The Unfolding Year* [devotions for public and private use from ancient and modern sources] (10s. 6d.); A. L. Peck, *Anglicanism and Episcopacy: A Re-examination of Evidence* (16s.).

HARVILL PRESS: Thérèse of Lisieux (tr. Ronald Knox), *Autobiography of a Saint* (21s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: E. Stanley Jones *Christian Maturity* [daily meditations for a year] (12s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Julian of Norwich, *On Showing of God's Love* [edited by A. M. Reynolds] (9s. 6d.); Paul Molinari, S.J., *Julian of Norwich* (16s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: O. Cullmann and J. Leenhardt, *Essays on the Lord's Supper* (7s. 6d.); Michael Hennell, *John Venn and the Clapham Sect* (30s.).

MACMILLAN: Bernard Mayo, *Ethics and the Moral Life* (21s.); John Wilson, *Language and Christian Belief* (9s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: B. A. Smith, *Dean Church* (30s.).

PHOENIX HOUSE: A. Tindal Hart, *The Country Clergy in Elizabethan and Stuart Times* (21s.).

RYERSON PRESS (TORONTO): Hugh T. Kerr, *Mystery and Meaning in the Christian Faith* ($1.00).

SANDS: Celestin Charlier, *The Christian Approach to the Bible* (18s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Joachim Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (7s. 6d.); Charles West, *Communism and the Theologians* (35s.); C. F. von Weizsacker, *Ethical and Political Problems of the Atomic Age* [Burge Memorial Lecture] (2s.); Mervyn Stockwood, *The Communion Service* [the Prayer Book service with a simple commentary] (1s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: C. C. Martindale, S.J., *Saint John and the Apocalypse* (12s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: J. C. Fenton, *Preaching the Cross* (7s. 6d.); Henry Blamires, *The Kirkbride Conversations* (4s. 6d.); Pierson Parker, *Christ our Hope* (5s. paper, 12s. 6d. cloth); John B. Wilson, *The Truth of Religion* (4s.); Nancy le Plastrier Warner, *Hugh Compton Warner* (15s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. (FOR THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY): W. R. Foster, *Bishop and Presbytery* (25s.).

TRUTH AND FAITH COMMITTEE: D. R. Hill, *Why Mass Vestments?* [an attack on the proposed new Canon XVII] (1s.).

TYNDALE PRESS: R. V. G. Tasker, *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (8s. 6d.).

WATTS: J. B. Coates, *A Challenge to Christianity* (15s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

## Dean Church

The Anglican Response to Newman

By B. A. SMITH

As a Tractarian who remained firmly Anglican in spirit, as a Somerset rector and co-founder of *The Guardian*, and finally as Dean of St. Paul's, 1871-90, R. W. Church played a key part in nineteenth-century Anglicanism. He was a friend of Gladstone, who consulted him about appointments; and Mr Smith has used the Church papers and the Gladstone papers in the British Museum to supplement published sources for this new biography, the first life of Church since 1894. There is a frontispiece, and six drawings by Lynton Lamb.

348 pages 30*s.* net

## Documents on Christian Unity

Fourth Series 1948-57

Edited by G. K. A. BELL

This latest volume of Bishop Bell's collection of Documents covers the period since Lambeth and Amsterdam, 1948, and is issued in laminated paper covers as well as in cloth boards.

264 pages Paper 10*s.* 6*d.* net Cloth 21*s.* net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

---

**THE OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF**

**THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE**

**WILL BE PUBLISHED**

**ON 26th AUGUST**

**BY**

**S·P·C·K**

# THE S·P·C·K PAPERBACKS——

## WHAT ARE SERAPH BOOKS?

PEOPLE ARE ASKING QUESTIONS

about the Church, about God. They are asking intelligent questions. They have a right to expect informed, intelligent answers.

WHO IS TO ANSWER THEM?

Informed, intelligent Christians—*lay Christians*. A layman who speaks is assured of a better audience than a clergyman. Naturally so; because the inquirer is more ready to listen to one who is 'in it', as he himself might be in it, than to the professional.

SERAPH BOOKS

form a library rather than a series. It is not suggested that any one reader needs, or will want, every Seraph book.

It is claimed that the Christian who is willing to read about his Faith will find in the Seraph library books which inform him in untechnical terms, but at an intelligent level, of the Christian beliefs, the impact of these beliefs on a man's living, on a nation's living, the reason for and the ways of worship, and the relation of other world religions to Christianity.

SERAPH BOOKS

are convenient in size: neither laboriously long nor scrappily short: written especially for the non-technical reader by authors who are masters of their subjects: attractive in appearance: reasonable in price.